

REMARKS

Dependent claim 41 has been objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Claim 41 has been amended as the Examiner suggested. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claim 41 is now patentable to Applicants.

Claim 39 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vance '738 in view of Zeira '342. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 39 defines “a first layer of substantially opaque material ... a plurality of light transmissive beads ... and a second layer of light-dispersing material having asymmetrical dispersion characteristics along orthogonal axes ... to enhance light transmission along one of the orthogonal axes relative to light transmission along another of the orthogonal axes.”

These aspects of the claimed invention facilitate dispersion of light for enlarging the viewing angle, for example, from on-axis orientation along horizontal axis 21 (Fig. 3). In this example, incident light entering the layer 12 approximately normal to an incident surface of the layer may be dispersed more predominantly along the horizontal axis 21 than the vertical axis 23.

These aspects of the invention are not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. As the Examiner correctly notes, the Vance reference lacks a layer having asymmetrical light dispersion. Instead, the Vance reference discloses enlarging is a patentably

distinguishable manner. Specifically, Vance, as presently understood, discloses expansion of viewing angles by adjusting, in any desired combination, the effective radius of the back surface of the beads, the index of refraction of the beads, and the indices of refraction of second (opaque) layer materials (8:65-9:2). For example, these factors may be adjusted to create gain profile 42, which has a wider range of viewing angles than gain profile 44 (Fig. 3). The Zeira reference, as currently understood, merely discloses a process for producing a light dispersing film, but does not disclose or suggest using the film as part of a multi-layer beaded screen.

The deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in combination, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. A *prima facie* showing of obviousness requires (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, (2) a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the reference(s) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants submit that they can find no suggestion or motivation to modify Vance by adding the light-dispersing layer of Zeira for the purpose of enlarging the viewing angles of the filter. Since Vance already discloses three ways of enlarging the viewing angles of the filter, there is no suggestion or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Vance with the Zeira layer for the same purpose.

Likewise, the Vance reference relies on a different method of enlarging viewing angles than the Applicants' method of using a layer having asymmetrical light dispersion. By proposing an alternative to the ways by which the claimed invention enlarges viewing angles, the Vance reference leads one of ordinary skill in the art in a direction divergent

from the claimed invention. Furthermore, the suggested combination could only be derived from the Examiner's hindsight reconstruction of these elements using instructions found only in Applicant's own specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 39 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 40 and 42-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vance '738 in light of Zeira '342. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These dependent claims are further limited from their predecessor claims by the specific recitations of the second layer "disposed to receive light emanating from the apertures" or the light filter "including a conformal layer of transmissive material affixed to the back surface of the first layer and the remaining portions of the beads to receive incident light" and/or with beads with a "radius R, and the thickness of the conformal layer is not greater than R" and/or "thickness of the conformal layer is about ten percent (10%) of R" or "further comprising a support layer of transparent material disposed intermediate the beads and the second layer" or "further comprising a thin transparent layer disposed between the first layer and the second layer, the beads penetrating the first layer and the thin transparent layer to form apertures of increased diameter."

These aspects of the invention as now variously claimed are not shown or suggested by the cited art, and have not been shown to be old or well known in this art. It is therefore respectfully submitted that these dependent claims, specifically claims 40 and 42-47, are further limited over the claims from which they depend are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 39, 40, and 42-47 are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNIS W. VANCE AND
CHARLES ROBERT WOLFE

Dated: July 21, 2004

By: 

Jennifer R. Johnson, Reg. No. 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Telephone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200